

DOCUMENT RESUME


ED 462 485

UD 034 763

AUTHOR Jerald, Craig D.
TITLE Dispelling the Myth Revisited: Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of "High-Flying" Schools.
INSTITUTION Education Trust, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, NY.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 27p.; For the report on California, see UD 034 762.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Numerical/Quantitative Data (110)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Black Students; Elementary Secondary Education; Hispanic American Students; *Low Income Groups; *Minority Group Children; Poverty; Rural Schools; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS African Americans; Latinos

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how many high-poverty and high-minority schools nationwide had high student performance, identifying 4,577 schools nationwide that had students with reading and/or math performance in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade level, at least 50 percent low-income students, and at least 50 percent African American and Hispanic students. Data came from an American Institutes for Research database that combines school-level assessment scores with demographic and other kinds of basic information on nearly all of the nation's schools. There were 3,592 high-performing, high-poverty schools; 2,305 high-performing, high-minority schools; and 1,320 high-performing, high-poverty-and-minority schools. These schools educated approximately 2,070,000 million public school students, including 1,280,000 low-income students, 564,000 African American students, and 660,000 Hispanic students. As a group, these high-achieving schools enroll much higher proportions of poor and minority children than the nation's public schools as a whole. Schools on the high-performing, high-poverty list educated twice the proportion of low-income students than all schools nationally and were more likely to be in cities or rural areas. (SM)



Dispelling the Myth Revisited:

Dispelling the Myth Revisited:

Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of "High-Flying" Schools

Craig D. Jerald



The
Education
Trust

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

□ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Barth
The Education Trust
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

Acknowledgments

This report would not have been possible without the hard work contributed by many individuals, in particular, Don McLaughlin and Ann Win of the American Institutes of Research and our many colleagues at the Education Trust. We are also grateful to the Carnegie Corporation of New York for supporting this important work. Finally, we would like to thank Meredith Miller and Alan Ginsburg of the U.S. Department of Education and Rolf Blank of the Council of Chief State School Officers for their encouragement on this project.

Author: Craig D. Jerald

Data Analysts: Hector Sanchez
Yun Yi
Sandra Huang

Editors: Jeanne Brennan
Nicole Grayson
Kati Haycock
Amy Wilkins


Graphic Design: Autumn Richardson

The Education Trust, Inc. was created to promote high academic achievement for all students, at all levels—kindergarten through college. While we know that all schools and colleges could better serve their students, our work focuses on the schools and colleges most often left behind in education improvement efforts: those serving Latino, African American, Native American and low-income students.

The Education Trust works alongside policy makers, parents, education professionals, community and business leaders, in cities and towns across the country, who are trying to transform their schools and colleges into institutions that genuinely serve all students. We also share lessons learned in these schools, colleges and communities with policy makers in Washington to ensure that there is a voice for students in the national debate.

Copyright © The Education Trust, Inc., 2001.

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools



Executive Summary

A number of organizations have issued reports on high-performing, high-poverty schools over the past few years. Those reports have provided compelling evidence that public schools can educate poor and minority students to very high levels of achievement. However, most have highlighted only a handful of schools in scattered locations. Even the most comprehensive report to date, the Education Trust's *Dispelling the Myth* 1999, couldn't provide information on more than a few hundred schools across 21 states.

So far no organization interested in this topic has been able to answer a fundamental question: **How many high-poverty and high-minority schools nationwide have high student performance?**

To answer that question, the Education Trust analyzed information from a massive new U.S. Department of Education database developed by the American Institutes for Research. This is the first published analysis of the database. The report also provides a preliminary glimpse of where such "high-flying" schools are and what they look like.

The analysis identified a total of 4,577 schools nationwide in the year 2000 that met the following criteria:

- Students' reading and/or math performance was in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade level (e.g., elementary);

- Plus, they met either one or both of the following:

- the percentage of low-income students in the school was at least 50% and ranked in the top third of schools at that grade level; and/or
- the percentage of African American and Latino students in the school was at least 50% and ranked in the top third of schools at that grade level.

Based on these criteria, the Education Trust identified:

- 3,592 high-performing, high-poverty schools,
- 2,305 high-performing, high-minority schools; and
- 1,320 high-performing, high-poverty and minority schools.

Altogether, these schools educate approximately 2,070,000 public school students, including:

- about 1,280,000 low-income students;
- about 564,000 African American students; and
- about 660,000 Latino students.

As a group, these "high-flying" schools enroll much higher proportions of poor and minority children than the nation's public schools as a whole. For example, schools on the high-performing, high-poverty list educated twice the proportion of low-income students compared with all schools nationally. Schools on the combined list were also more likely to be in cities or rural areas.

Clearly, there are more than a handful of high-poverty and high-minority schools in the U.S. that are also high-performing. We intend to study these "high-flying" schools further to draw lessons about how to close achievement gaps nationwide. We hope others join us in this endeavor by using a new tool on the Education Trust's Web site, *Dispelling the Myth Online* at www.edtrust.org. This site allows users to search for high-performing schools according to users own achievement and demographic criteria.

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools

Introduction

A number of organizations have issued reports on high-performing, high-poverty schools over the past few years. Those reports have provided compelling evidence that public schools can educate poor and minority students to very high levels of achievement. However, most have highlighted only a handful of schools in scattered locations. Even the most comprehensive report to date, the Education Trust's *Dispelling the Myth* (1999), couldn't provide information on more than a few hundred schools across 21 states.

So far no organization interested in this topic has been able to answer a fundamental question: **How many high-poverty and high-minority schools nationwide also have high student performance?**

This report finally tackles that question. And the answer is: thousands. In fact, across all of the criteria described below, this analysis found 4,755 individual "high-flying" schools serving over 2 million public school students, including more than 1 million low-income students, 564,000 African-American students, and 660,000 Latino students.

How We Conducted the Analysis

1. Criteria for Identifying Schools

Any answer to the question posed above inevitably depends on the criteria one uses to identify such schools. Our new interactive Web site, *Dispelling the Myth Online*, allows users to search for high-performing schools using users' own demographic and achievement criteria.

For this analysis, we used the following criteria to generate three separate lists:

1). High-Performing, **High-Poverty** Schools

- a. Student reading and/or math performance is in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary); and

- b. The percentage of low-income students is at least 50% AND ranks in the top third among schools in the state at the same grade level.

2). High-Performing, **High-Minority** Schools

- a. Student reading and/or math performance is in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary); and
- b. The percentage of African-American and Latino students is at least 50% AND ranks in the top third among schools in the state at the same grade level.

3). High-Performing, **High-Poverty-and-Minority** Schools

- a. Student reading and/or math performance is in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary);
- b. The percentage of low-income students is at least 50% AND ranks in the top third among schools in the state at the same grade level; and
- c. The percentage of African-American and Latino students is at least 50% AND ranks in the top third among schools in the state at the same grade level.

Low-income students were defined as those eligible for the federal free or reduced-price lunch program.

We used a relative achievement measure (i.e., student performance in the top third among schools) because testing programs differ dramatically across states, and achievement results cannot be compared across state lines. Currently, there is no way to compare the performance of individual schools in Connecticut, for instance, with individual schools in Mississippi. Thus, care should be taken not to assume that "high-performing" schools in those two states would perform near the same level if they took the same test. (The National Assessment of Educational Progress tests sam-

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

ples of students in each state. *Education Watch Online*, another Ed Trust Web tool available at www.edtrust.org, allows users to compare the average statewide performance of poor and minority students and the gaps separating student groups on NAEP across state lines.)

We included both relative and absolute demographic criteria in the analysis. We devised the relative demographic criterion (i.e., among the top third of schools in low income or minority enrollment) because student demographics differ widely across states. The schools that educators consider to have the greatest "challenges" in Nebraska look quite different than the ones considered to have the greatest "challenges" in California. The relative criterion ensures that we captured those higher-performing schools considered to have the "most challenging" students in each state.

The absolute demographic criterion (i.e., at least 50% low-income or minority students) provided a floor so that, particularly in states with relatively low percentages of poor and minority children, the list does not include schools with only average- or below-average poor and minority enrollments by national standards.

Taken together, the resulting criteria are fair yet rigorous. For example, the relative demographic criterion disqualified nearly 1,500 schools that were in the top third of student performance and enrolled more than 50% low-income or minority students, but where the poverty or minority enrollment rates did not rank in the top third of schools. Researchers or others who wish to search for schools according to an absolute demographic cutoff only can do so using *Dispelling the Myth Online*.

We want to be especially clear about one point. We did **not** compare the performance of high poverty and high minority schools with demographically "similar" schools, as many other Web sites and research reports have done. Schools had to have student performance in the top third of *all the schools in the state that took the test* in order to meet our achievement cutoff.

2. Data Sources Used

We analyzed information from a massive new database created by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) under contract to the U.S. Department of Education's Planning and Evaluation Service. That database is the same one we used to create *Dispelling the Myth Online*. It is the largest U.S. public schools database ever developed, and the first to combine school-level assessment scores along with demographic and other kinds of basic information on nearly all of the nation's schools.

AIR created the database by obtaining school-level assessment result databases from nearly every state, then integrating that information with the U.S. Department of Education's nationwide database of public school information, the Common Core of Data (CCD). The CCD contains non-achievement data on the nation's schools, including enrollment, demographic, and geographic data, as well as addresses and phone numbers. In cases where a whole state did not report race/ethnicity breakouts or counts of students eligible for the free and reduced-price lunch program, AIR estimated such data for each school based on prior years' data.

In states without reading test scores, we analyzed language arts scores if they were available. Three states did not break out their test scores by subject, instead providing only "total" composite scores in various grade levels. We analyzed such "total" scores in Louisiana, South Dakota, and West Virginia.

Unfortunately, we could not analyze schools in the following states because school level achievement data were not available:

- Iowa does not have a statewide testing program; and
- New Mexico and North Dakota could not provide school level test scores for the database.

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

In addition, only fourth grade scores in Washington State could be analyzed for the high performing, high-poverty lists. The state did not report free- and reduced-price lunch data for its schools in 2000, and estimates were only available for elementary schools at the time we conducted the analysis.

Our final counts of "high flying" schools thus slightly underestimate the number of schools nationwide that are both high performing and high-poverty or high-minority. While Iowa currently has no plans to introduce a uniform statewide testing program, we hope future versions of the database, and *Dispelling the Myth Online*, can include information on schools in New Mexico and North Dakota.

3. Methodology

We analyzed over one million separate school-level test scores contained in the AIR database. If a score was in the top third among all schools taking the test, and if the school met both the relative and absolute demographic criteria, we included the school on the appropriate list. We then combined all three lists to generate an unduplicated, nationwide count of schools meeting any of the three sets of criteria.

We did not exclude any statewide tests from this analysis. For example, if a state tested fifth grade math using two separate tests, we analyzed both sets of test results for each school. However, if a state had a standards-based test that yielded information on the percentage of students reaching different achievement levels (e.g., basic, proficient, advanced), we only analyzed the level most equivalent to passing or proficient (i.e., the level identified in state policy as "good enough").

It is important to note that these counts are not meant to represent definitive lists of "good" schools. We would want to know more about schools before certifying them as such. For example, we do not know how many or which schools on the list have substantial within-school achievement gaps, nor do we know which will sustain their high performance in the future. The Education Trust will investigate those questions


over time as new data that can provide such answers are collected by states and incorporated into *Dispelling the Myth Online*.

Findings

Our most basic finding is also our most important. Nationwide, thousands of schools met one or more sets of the achievement and demographic criteria described above, including:

- 3,592 high-performing, high-poverty schools;
- 2,305 high-performing, high-minority schools; and
- 1,320 high-performing, high-poverty and minority schools.

Obviously, a number of schools met more than one set of criteria. We combined the lists to generate an unduplicated count of individual schools. That list included 4,577 separate schools qualifying under one or more sets of criteria.



Taken as a whole, these schools educate approximately 2,070,000 public school students, including


- about 1,280,000 low-income students;
- about 564,000 African American students; and
- about 660,000 Latino students.

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

We also examined the extent to which schools qualified in more than one subject. Across the full, combined list of schools, nearly half—46%—were high performing in both math AND reading or language arts.


The schools on these lists differ greatly—both demographically and geographically—from national averages. For example, schools on the high-performing, high-poverty list have about twice the rate of low income students compared with all public schools nationally, and score as well or better than two-thirds of schools in their respective states.

Demographic Characteristics of "High Flying" Schools



* "Low income" students qualify for federal free or reduced-price lunch program. "Minority" includes African-American and Latino students.
 Sources: 1) Education Trust analysis of data from Dispersing the Myth Online and 2) Education Trust calculations based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics Web site at <http://nces.ed.gov>. Chart displays weighted averages.

Geographic Location of "High-Flying" Schools



* African American and Latino
 Sources: 1) Education Trust analysis of data from Dispersing the Myth Online and 2) National Center for Education Statistics, Overview of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools and Districts School Year 1999-2000, July 2001.

Some commentators claim that high-poverty and high-minority schools that are high-performing use selective admission policies to enroll a more elite group of students. The results of our analysis suggest otherwise. While schools on all of our lists were somewhat more likely to identify themselves as magnet schools compared with schools nationally, the difference was not great, and in no case did more than 8% of schools on a list identify themselves as such. For example, 5% of schools on the combined list of 4,577 identified themselves as magnet schools, compared

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

with about 2% nationally. In addition, the schools on these lists were slightly less likely to identify themselves as charter schools than were public schools on average—1% compared with 2%, respectively.

However, those results should be interpreted with caution until we have more information about the schools. A large number of schools in the database did not report whether or not they were charter or magnet schools. In addition, we observed a number of schools in the lists that clearly were charter or magnet schools based on their names but had not identified themselves as such on the federal survey used to collect information about them. Since those schools had “identified” themselves as charter or magnet schools in their names, if not on the survey, we counted those schools as such for the purpose of this analysis. The 1999-2000 Common Core of Data survey was the first to ask schools to report such information about themselves; we hope these data become more reliable in coming years.

We intend to use these lists as the basis for future research on “high flying” schools, including qualitative analyses of school programs and practices that contribute to their high performance. The schools that are high-performing, high-poverty, and high-minority are of particular interest and provide a fertile ground for such research. More than three quarters of the students in those schools are low-income, and more than four in five are either African American or Latino. Over one third of these schools are in big-city school districts. Yet their students perform among the top third of schools in their states.

The tables at the end of the report provide such statistics for “high flying” schools on each list, as well as a count of schools by state on each list.

However, we **strongly caution readers to avoid state-by-state comparisons** for the following reasons:

- Whole states differ demographically, and some states have far fewer schools that would be “eligible” for our lists based on demographic criteria alone. For example, Delaware has relatively fewer

schools to begin with, and, in part because of a history of desegregation, also has relatively fewer schools with more than 50% low-income or African American and Latino students. Its low number of schools on these lists therefore cannot be interpreted as meaning that the state’s high-poverty or high-minority schools perform worse than a state with a higher number of schools on the list. Cross state comparisons of that nature would require a very different methodology than the one used for this analysis.

- States have widely different student assessment programs. Currently, there is no common test given to students in every public school across the nation. (As mentioned earlier, the National Assessment of Educational Progress only tests students in a sample of schools in each state and across the nation. *Education Watch Online*, also available at www.edtrust.org, allows users to compare the average statewide performance of poor and minority students and the gaps separating student groups on NAEP across state lines.) Since each state uses its own tests based on its own academic standards, a relatively high-performing school in Wisconsin might score much higher than a top tier school Louisiana if the students in them were given the same test.

Conclusion

More than 20 years ago the Harvard educator and researcher Ron Edmonds asked, “How many effective schools would you have to see to be persuaded of the educability of poor children?”

This report fills in the information gap Ron Edmonds faced as he attempted to draw attention to how such schools could help many educators overcome their limited expectations for poor and minority children. We believe that, were he with us today, he would be delighted to learn that there are thousands of schools across the nation that enroll high numbers of such children and are high-performing. Even so, more work remains to be done.

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

We hope others will join us in our efforts to identify and examine high-performing, high-poverty and high-minority schools. To that end, the Education Trust has incorporated the same large database used for this analysis into a dynamic new Web tool, *Dispelling the Myth Online*, available at <http://www.edtrust.org>. This online tool allows users to generate their own lists of high-performing schools according to demographic and achievement criteria that they select.

In addition, while this analysis did not analyze schools based on improvement in test scores, *Dispelling the Myth Online* allows users to search for faster-improving schools in states where multiple years of assessment data are available. For example, Harrison Elementary School in Brainerd, Minnesota, with 65% low-income enrollment, was among the top eight percent of improvers on the state's 5th grade reading test between 1999 and 2000. South Park Elementary in Pueblo, Colorado, with 65% low-income and 58% Latino students, was among the top two percent of improvers on the state's 4th grade reading test between 1999 and 2000.

We intend to update *Dispelling the Myth Online* with new information several times per year as states release new test scores for schools. We also plan to introduce data on the performance of groups within schools as states move to make such data available over the next few years.

Our hope is that journalists, policymakers, educators, and researchers make frequent use of *Dispelling the Myth Online*. If we as a nation are serious about closing the achievement gaps between poor and minority children and other students, we must begin to look more seriously at "high-flying" schools and learn from what they can tell us about how to accomplish that goal.

Full, Combined List of Schools

- Student reading and/or math performance is in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary);
- Plus either one or both of the following criteria:
 - Percentage low-income students is at least 50% and ranks in top third of schools at that grade level; and/or
 - Percentage African American and Latino students is at least 50% and ranks in top third of schools at that grade level

Number of schools qualifying: 4,577

Low-Income (FRPL) Students	62%			
African American & Latino Students	59%			
	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	3,066	2,220	213	47
School Reported "NO"	819	496	2,294	3,593
Information Not Available	692	1,861	2,070	937
Total	4,577	4,577	4,577	4,577
	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	67%	49%	5%	1%
School Reported "NO"	18%	11%	50%	79%
Information Not Available	15%	41%	45%	20%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Large City	964	21%		
Mid-Size City	644	14%		
Urban Fringe of Large City	576	13%		
Urban Fringe of Mid-Size City	239	5%		
Large Town	51	1%		
Small Town	446	10%		
Rural, Inside Metropolitan Area	208	5%		
Rural, Outside Metropolitan Area	1,254	27%		
Information Not Available	195	4%		
Total	4,577	100%		

* Or school had the word in its name.

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

Full, Combined List of Schools, Continued

- Student reading and/or math performance in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary);
- Plus either or both of the following:
 - Percentage low-income students at least 50% and in top third of schools at that grade level; and/or
 - Percentage African American and Latino students at least 50% and in top third of schools at that grade level

CAUTION! Do not use this list to make comparisons across states concerning the performance of schools. Schools had to have at least 50% low-income and/or minority students to qualify for inclusion, and some states have very few such schools to begin with.

Alabama	188	Montana	23
Alaska	18	Nebraska	35
Arizona	110	Nevada	11
Arkansas	74	New Hampshire	0
California	427	New Jersey	45
Colorado	20	New Mexico	n/a
Connecticut	12	New York	126
Delaware	3	North Carolina	293
DC	12	North Dakota	n/a
Florida	180	Ohio	92
Georgia	147	Oklahoma	105
Hawaii	5	Oregon	96
Idaho	43	Pennsylvania	48
Illinois	84	Rhode Island	5
Indiana	61	South Carolina	85
Iowa	n/a	South Dakota	35
Kansas	52	Tennessee	49
Kentucky	132	Texas	1,069
Louisiana	96	Utah	18
Maine	59	Vermont	13
Maryland	58	Virginia	59
Massachusetts	13	Washington	1*
Michigan	188	West Virginia	121
Minnesota	44	Wisconsin	26
Mississippi	41	Wyoming	12
Missouri	143	Total	4,577

* Search limited because Washington did not report FRPL data in 2000, and estimates were available only for elementary schools.

By Poverty

- Student reading and/or math performance in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary); and
- Percentage low-income students at least 50% and in top third of schools at that grade level

Number of schools qualifying: 3,592

Low-Income (FRPL) Students	72%			
African American & Latino Students	53%			
	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	2,597	1,912	108	23
School Reported "NO"	420	410	1,923	2,745
Information Not Available	575	1,270	1,561	824
Total	3,592	3,592	3,592	3,592
	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	72%	53%	3%	1%
School Reported "NO"	12%	11%	54%	76%
Information Not Available	16%	35%	43%	23%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Large City	641	18%		
Mid-Size City	426	12%		
Urban Fringe of Large City	318	9%		
Urban Fringe of Mid-Size City	178	5%		
Large Town	44	1%		
Small Town	399	11%		
Rural, Inside Metropolitan Area	180	5%		
Rural, Outside Metropolitan Area	1,222	34%		
Information Not Available	184	5%		
Total	3,592	100%		

* Or school had the word in its name

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

By Poverty, Continued

- Student reading and/or math performance in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary); and
- Percentage low-income students at least 50% and in top third of schools at that grade level

CAUTION! Do not use this list to make comparisons across states concerning the performance of schools. Schools had to have at least 50% low-income and/or minority students to qualify for inclusion, and some states have very few such schools to begin with.

Alabama	140	Montana	23
Alaska	18	Nebraska	35
Arizona	66	Nevada	7
Arkansas	63	New Hampshire	0
California	303	New Jersey	37
Colorado	18	New Mexico	n/a
Connecticut	7	New York	89
Delaware	3	North Carolina	224
DC	12	North Dakota	n/a
Florida	87	Ohio	71
Georgia	105	Oklahoma	103
Hawaii	5	Oregon	95
Idaho	43	Pennsylvania	37
Illinois	51	Rhode Island	5
Indiana	51	South Carolina	62
Iowa	n/a	South Dakota	35
Kansas	51	Tennessee	26
Kentucky	130	Texas	803
Louisiana	68	Utah	18
Maine	59	Vermont	13
Maryland	41	Virginia	39
Massachusetts	11	Washington	1*
Michigan	164	West Virginia	121
Minnesota	43	Wisconsin	26
Mississippi	37	Wyoming	12
Missouri	134	Total	3,592

* Search limited because Washington did not report FRPL data in 2000, and estimates were available only for elementary schools.

By African American and Latino Enrollment

- Student reading and/or math performance in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary); and
- Percentage African American and Latino students at least 50% and in top third of schools at that grade level

Number of schools qualifying: 2,305

Low-Income (FRPL) Students	59%			
African American & Latino Students	78%			
	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	1,395	1,087	186	41
School Reported "NO"	559	149	918	1,992
Information Not Available	351	1,069	1,201	272
Total	2,305	2,305	2,305	2,305
	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	61%	47%	8%	2%
School Reported "NO"	24%	6%	40%	86%
Information Not Available	15%	46%	52%	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Large City	796	35%		
Mid-Size City	440	19%		
Urban Fringe of Large City	440	19%		
Urban Fringe of Mid-Size City	123	5%		
Large Town	29	1%		
Small Town	150	7%		
Rural, Inside Metropolitan Area	81	4%		
Rural, Outside Metropolitan Area	197	9%		
Information Not Available	49	2%		
Total	2,305	100%		

* Or school had the word in its name.

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

By African American and Latino Enrollment, Continued

- Student reading and/or math performance in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary); and
- Percentage African American and Latino students at least 50% and in top third of schools at that grade level

CAUTION! Do not use this list to make comparisons across states concerning the performance of schools. Schools had to have at least 50% low-income and/or minority students to qualify for inclusion, and some states have very few such schools to begin with.

Alabama	114	Montana	0
Alaska	0	Nebraska	5
Arizona	94	Nevada	8
Arkansas	17	New Hampshire	0
California	236	New Jersey	43
Colorado	7	New Mexico	n/a
Connecticut	9	New York	72
Delaware	1	North Carolina	157
DC	0	North Dakota	n/a
Florida	131	Ohio	38
Georgia	114	Oklahoma	13
Hawaii	0	Oregon	2
Idaho	0	Pennsylvania	13
Illinois	81	Rhode Island	0
Indiana	18	South Carolina	59
Iowa	n/a	South Dakota	0
Kansas	4	Tennessee	32
Kentucky	3	Texas	720
Louisiana	62	Utah	1
Maine	0	Vermont	0
Maryland	33	Virginia	37
Massachusetts	7	Washington	0
Michigan	117	West Virginia	1
Minnesota	2	Wisconsin	9
Mississippi	19	Wyoming	1
Missouri	25	Total	2,305

By Poverty Plus African American and Latino Enrollment

- Student reading and/or math performance in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary);
- Percentage low-income students at least 50% and in top third of schools at that grade level; and
- Percentage African American and Latino students at least 50% and in top third of schools at that grade level

Number of schools qualifying: 1,320

Low-Income (FRPL) Students	78%			
African American & Latino Students	84%			
	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	926	779	81	17
School Reported "NO"	160	63	547	1,144
Information Not Available	234	478	692	159
Total	1,320	1,320	1,320	1,320
	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	70%	59%	6%	1%
School Reported "NO"	12%	5%	41%	87%
Information Not Available	18%	36%	52%	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Large City	473	36%		
Mid-Size City	222	17%		
Urban Fringe of Large City	182	14%		
Urban Fringe of Mid-Size City	62	5%		
Large Town	22	2%		
Small Town	103	8%		
Rural, Inside Metropolitan Area	53	4%		
Rural, Outside Metropolitan Area	165	13%		
Information Not Available	38	3%		
Total	1,320	100%		

* Or school had the word in its name.

DISPELLING THE MYTH REVISITED: *Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of High-Performing Schools*

By Poverty Plus African American and Latino Enrollment, Continued

- Student reading and/or math performance in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade-level (e.g., elementary);
- Percentage Low-Income in Top Third of Tested Schools and at Least 50%; and
- African American and Latino Enrollment in Top Third of Tested Schools and at Least 50%

CAUTION! Do not use this list to make comparisons across states concerning the performance of schools. Schools had to have at least 50% low-income and/or minority students to qualify for inclusion, and some states have very few such schools to begin with.

Alabama	66	Montana	0
Alaska	0	Nebraska	5
Arizona	50	Nevada	4
Arkansas	6	New Hampshire	0
California	112	New Jersey	35
Colorado	5	New Mexico	n/a
Connecticut	4	New York	35
Delaware	1	North Carolina	88
DC	0	North Dakota	n/a
Florida	38	Ohio	17
Georgia	72	Oklahoma	11
Hawaii	0	Oregon	1
Idaho	0	Pennsylvania	2
Illinois	48	Rhode Island	0
Indiana	8	South Carolina	36
Iowa	n/a	South Dakota	0
Kansas	3	Tennessee	9
Kentucky	1	Texas	454
Louisiana	34	Utah	1
Maine	0	Vermont	0
Maryland	16	Virginia	17
Massachusetts	5	Washington	0*
Michigan	93	West Virginia	1
Minnesota	1	Wisconsin	9
Mississippi	15	Wyoming	1
Missouri	16	Total	1,320

* Search limited because Washington did not report FRPL data in 2000, and estimates were available only for elementary schools.

National Data

Following are data on the nation's public schools as a whole, regardless of their performance. This information is included to provide context, but should not be used to draw conclusions about the relative performance of schools in different geographic areas of the nation.

Number of schools: **89,599**

Low-Income (FRPL) Students 37%
African American & Latino Students 33%

	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	39,596	16,658	1,372	1,524
School Reported "NO"	34,887	15,808	54,909	68,685
Information Not Available	15,116	57,133	33,318	19,390
Total	89,599	89,599	89,599	89,599

	Title I	Title I Schoolwide	Magnet	Charter
School Reported "YES"	44%	19%	2%	2%
School Reported "NO"	39%	18%	61%	77%
Information Not Available	17%	64%	37%	22%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Large City	10,977	12%
Mid-Size City	11,052	12%
Urban Fringe of Large City	21,240	24%
Urban Fringe of Mid-Size City	7,615	8%
Large Town	1,162	1%
Small Town	10,371	12%
Rural, Inside Metropolitan Area	9,978	11%
Rural, Outside Metropolitan Area	17,199	19%
Information Not Available	5	<1%
Total	89,599	100%